



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/022,138	12/13/2001	Thomas Schultz	ORT-1548	2788
27777	7590	04/16/2007	EXAMINER	
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			QAZI, SABIHA NAIM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	04/16/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/022,138	SCHULTZ ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sabiha Qazi	1616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 6-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

Final Office Action

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-8 are pending. No claim is allowed at this time.

Amendments are entered.

Summary of this Office Action dated 02/09/2009

1. Information Disclosure Statement
2. Copending Applications
3. Specification
4. 35 USC § 112 --- First Paragraph Written Description Rejection
5. 35 USC § 112 --- First Paragraph Scope of Enablement Rejection
6. 35 USC § 103(a) Rejection
7. Response to Arguments
8. CONCLUSION
9. Communication

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc., 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112—Written Description Rejection

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Following reasons apply.

In the present case Applicant has no possession of an oral steroid hormone product having improved dissolution and release rate properties, said product comprising at least one steroid hormone in admix with lactose, wherein substantially all of the said of the said at least one steroid hormone is in non crystalline form and wherein said lactose stabilizes said hormone in its non-crystalline form.

In specification Example 1 on page 15 and Table 7 on page 21 a progestin norgestimate is disclosed. There is nothing in the disclosure, which indicate that applicant had the possession of an oral hormonal product containing any steroid hormone in non-crystalline form, which would be an improvement. Applicant had no possession of the claimed subject matter at the time this application was filed.

The written description requirement prevents applications from using the amendment process to update the disclosure in their disclosures (claims or specification) during the pendency before the patent office. Otherwise applicants could add new matter to their disclosures and date them back to their original filing date, thus defeating an accurate accounting of the priority of the invention. See 35 USC 132. The function of description requirement is to ensure that the inventor had possession, as of filing date of the application relied on, the specific subject matter claimed by him.

See *Genetech*, 108 F 3d 1361, 1365 (Fed. Cir. at 1366, 78, 1999).

The test for determining compliance with the written description requirement is whether the disclosure of the application as originally filed reasonably conveys to one skilled in the art that the inventor had the possession at the time of the later claimed subject matter, rather than the presence or absence of literal support in the specification for the claimed language. See *In re Kaslow*, 707 F 2d 1366, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

See MPEP 2163.06, for Applicant convenience relevant portion is as follows:

**GENERAL PRINCIPLES GOVERNING COMPLIANCE WITH THE
"WRITTEN DESCRIPTION" REQUIREMENT FOR APPLICATIONS**

The first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 requires that the "specification shall contain a written description of the invention * * *." This requirement is separate and distinct from the enablement requirement. See, e.g., *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1560, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1114 (Fed. Cir. 1991). >See also *Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 358 F.3d 916, 920-23, 69 USPQ2d 1886, 1890-93 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (discussing history and purpose of the written description requirement); *In re Curtis*, 354 F.3d 1347, 1357, 69 USPQ2d 1274, 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ("conclusive evidence of a claim's enablement is not equally conclusive of that claim's satisfactory written description").< The written description requirement has several policy objectives. "[T]he 'essential goal' of the description of the invention requirement is to clearly convey the information that an applicant has invented the subject matter which is claimed." *In re Barker*, 559 F.2d 588, 592 n.4, 194 USPQ 470, 473 n.4 (CCPA 1977). Another objective is to put the public in possession of what the applicant claims as the invention. See *Regents of the University of*

California v. Eli Lilly, 119 F.3d 1559, 1566, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1997), *cert. denied*, 523 U.S. 1089 (1998). The written description requirement of the Patent Act promotes the progress of the useful arts by ensuring that patentees adequately describe their inventions in their patent specifications in exchange for the right to exclude others from practicing the invention for the duration of the patent's term.

To satisfy the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., *>Moba, B.V. v. Diamond Automation, Inc.*, 325 F.3d 1306, 1319, 66 USPQ2d 1429, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *< Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116. However, a showing of possession alone does not cure the lack of a written description. *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.*, **>323 F.3d 956, 969-70, < 63 USPQ2d 1609, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Much of the written description case law addresses whether the specification as originally filed supports claims not originally in the application. The issue raised in the cases is most often phrased as whether the original application provides "adequate support" for the claims at issue or whether the material added to the specification incorporates "new matter" in violation of 35 U.S.C. 132. The "written description" question similarly arises in the interference context, where the issue is whether the specification of one party to the interference can

support the newly added claims corresponding to the count at issue, i.e., whether that party can "make the claim" corresponding to the interference count. See, e.g., *Martin v. Mayer*, 823 F.2d 500, 503, 3 USPQ2d 1333, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 1987). In addition, early opinions suggest the Patent and Trademark Office was unwilling to find written descriptive support when the only description was found in the claims; however, this viewpoint was rejected. See *In re Koller*, 613 F.2d 819, 204 USPQ 702 (CCPA 1980) (original claims constitute their own description); accord *In re Gardner*, 475 F.2d 1389, 177 USPQ 396 (CCPA 1973); accord *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976). It is now well accepted that a satisfactory description may be in the claims or any other portion of the originally filed specification. These early opinions did not address the quality or specificity of particularity that was required in the description, i.e., how much description is enough.

An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Possession may be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing that the invention was "ready for patenting" such as by the disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show

that the invention was complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Pfaff v. Wells Elecs., Inc.*, 525 U.S. 55, 68, 119 S.Ct. 304, 312, 48 USPQ2d 1641, 1647 (1998); *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406; *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1206, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1021 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (one must define a compound by "whatever characteristics sufficiently distinguish it"). "Compliance with the written description requirement is essentially a fact-based inquiry that will 'necessarily vary depending on the nature of the invention claimed.'" *Enzo Biochem*, **>323 F.3d at 963<, 63 USPQ2d at 1613. An application specification may show actual reduction to practice by describing testing of the claimed invention or, in the case of biological materials, by specifically describing a deposit made in accordance with 37 CFR 1.801 *et seq.* See *Enzo Biochem*, **>323 F.3d at 965<, 63 USPQ2d at 1614 ("reference in the specification to a deposit may also satisfy the written description requirement with respect to a claimed material"); see also Deposit of Biological Materials for Patent Purposes, Final Rule, 54 FR 34,864 (August 22, 1989) ("The requirement for a specific identification is consistent with the description requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112, and to provide an antecedent basis for the biological material which either has been or will be deposited before the patent is granted." Id. at 34,876. "The description must be sufficient to permit verification that

the deposited biological material is in fact that disclosed. Once the patent issues, the description must be sufficient to aid in the resolution of questions of infringement." Id. at 34,880.). Such a deposit is not a substitute for a written description of the claimed invention. The written description of the deposited material needs to be as complete as possible because the examination for patentability proceeds solely on the basis of the written description. See, e.g., *In re Lundak*, 773 F.2d 1216, 227 USPQ 90 (Fed. Cir. 1985). See also 54 FR at 34,880 ("As a general rule, the more information that is provided about a particular deposited biological material, the better the examiner will be able to compare the identity and characteristics of the deposited biological material with the prior art.").

A question as to whether a specification provides an adequate written description may arise in the context of an original claim which is not described sufficiently (see, e.g., *Enzo Biochem*, **>323 F.3d at 968<, 63 USPQ2d at 1616 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398), a new or amended claim wherein a claim limitation has been added or removed, or a claim to entitlement of an earlier priority date or effective filing date under 35 U.S.C. 119, 120, or 365(c). Most typically, the issue will arise in the context of determining whether new or amended claims are supported by the description of the invention in the application as filed (see, e.g., *In re Wright*, 866 F.2d 422, 9 USPQ2d 1649 (Fed. Cir. 1989)), whether a claimed invention is entitled to the benefit of an earlier priority

date or effective filing date under **35 U.S.C. 119, 120, or 365(c)** (see, e.g., *New Railhead Mfg. L.L.C. v. Vermeer Mfg. Co.*, 298 F.3d 1290, 63 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Tronzo v. Biomet, Inc.*, 156 F.3d 1154, 47 USPQ2d 1829 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 25 USPQ2d 1601 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Ziegler*, 992 F.2d 1197, 1200, 26 USPQ2d 1600, 1603 (Fed. Cir. 1993)), or whether a specification provides support for a claim corresponding to a count in an interference (see, e.g., *Fields v. Conover*, 443 F.2d 1386, 170 USPQ 276 (CCPA 1971)).

2163.06 Relationship of Written Description Requirement to New Matter

Lack of written description is an issue that generally arises with respect to the subject matter of a claim. If an applicant amends or attempts to amend the abstract, specification or drawings of an application, an issue of new matter will arise if the content of the amendment is not described in the application as filed. Stated another way, information contained in any one of the specification, claims or drawings of the application as filed may be added to any other part of the application without introducing new matter.

There are two statutory provisions that prohibit the introduction of new matter: **35 U.S.C. 132** - No amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention.

35 U.S.C. 112 Specification. - Patent Laws

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103 (a)

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over GAST¹, in view of MORITA, MERCK²; Sebhatu et al.; Rialkar et al and Bouckton et al. ((IDS references).

Amended claims are drawn to an oral steroid hormone product having improved dissolution and release rate properties, said product comprising at least one steroid hormone in admix with lactose, wherein substantially all of the said of the said at least one steroid hormone is in non crystalline form and wherein said lactose stabilizes said hormone in its non-crystalline form.

In specification Example 1 on page 15 and Table 7 on page 21 a progestin norgestimate is disclosed.

GAST teaches a hormonal product with an excipient in crystalline and non-crystalline form, which embraces applicant's claimed invention. See the entire documents especially examples 1 and 2, claims, lines 11-19 and lines 31-67 in col. 7 of GAST.

MORITA teaches that lactose has been widely used for solid pharmaceutical preparations and many grades are available for example official grade, crystalline, anhydrous, spray dried, or granulated lactose. Anhydrous and spray-dried and granulated lactose preparations have been used in direct compression applications. This classification is based on the manufacturing methods. On the other hand lactose has four crystallographic forms, namely alpha-monohydrate, alpha-anhydrate, beta-

¹ United States of America Patent No. 5,858,405.

² Merck Index, 12th edition, page 632 (3751)

anhydrate and amorphous form. See the entire document especially abstract, Tables I-III and page 4076 of the reference.

MERCK in section 3751 teaches that estrone *can be* crystallized.

Sebhaut et al.; Rialkar et al and Bouckton et al. teach the use of lactose. See the entire documents.

Instant claims differ from GAST in claiming a broader scope of non-crystalline steroid hormone. The difference between the instant invention and GAST is that the instant invention specifically claims the non-crystalline form while GAST is silent on specifically naming crystallization (Even though GAST discloses "Preferred salts of estrone include but are not limited to the sodium and piperate salt," it does not specifically use the words *crystalline* or *non-crystalline*) and MORITA et al which teaches the use of lactose in pharmaceutical preparations. MERCK in cited section 3751, teaches that estrone *can be* crystallized which means that it was not crystalline before. Also it can be used as estrones or its salts which can be crystallized or non-crystallized. GAST teaches the use of **lactose** in the formulation see example 1 on page 13 (example 1).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to prepare additional beneficial compositions for hormone replace therapy and other estrogen deficiencies because GAST teaches the limitations of the instantly claimed invention. Since GAST is silent on crystallization and lactose, the Examiner has cited MORITA which teaches use of lactose in pharmaceutical preparations and

MERCK, which teaches the crystallization process of estrone to show that estrone exists in both non-crystalline and crystalline forms.

Since no unexpected results and/or criticality seen, it would have been prima facie obvious to make and/or use non-crystalline form of the norgestimate teaching of GAST, MORITA, MERCK, SEBHATU et al., RAILKAR et al and BOUCKTON et al.. at the time of invention presently claimed invention would have been obvious to one skilled in the art.

The instant invention is *prima facie* obvious over the combined teachings of the prior art cited above. A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill might reasonably infer from the teachings. *In re opprecht* 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (Fed Cir. 1989); *In re Bode* 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA 1976). A reference is not limited to working examples. *In re Fracalossi* 215 USPQ 569 (CCPA 1982).

Accordingly, the burden of proof is upon applicants to show that instantly claimed subject matter is different and unobvious over those taught by prior art. See *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685, 688; *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430 and *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 293.

In absence of any criticality and/or unexpected results instant invention is considered *prima facie* obvious to one skilled in the art.

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Response to Arguments

- Claims are amended therefore anticipation rejection is withdrawn. Other rejections are maintained for the same reasons as set forth in our previous office action because arguments are not found persuasive.
- Applicant argue that "in the manufacture of steroid hormone products it would be highly desirable to increase the dissolution rate of the hormone while at the same time either improving or at least not reducing the physical/chemical stability of the hormone." These objectives are achieved by the claimed invention, as shown by the data set forth in Tables 1-4. In particular, the data in Table 1 demonstrate the difference in dissolution rates for non-crystalline norgestimate as compared to the lower-energy crystalline form. Note that the dissolution rate for amorphous norgestimate at 60 minutes is about the same as the lower energy crystalline form at 120 minutes and that the dissolution rate for the amorphous form at 120 minutes is significantly higher than the rate for the crystalline form at 140 minutes. The data in Tables 2 and 3 illustrates the effect on dissolution rate as norgestimate begins to re-crystallize from the higher energy amorphous form. As shown by these data, the dissolution rate of norgestimate decreases as the steroid converts to the lower energy crystalline form. The data in Table 4 show that the dissolution properties of norgestimate are not only dependent on storage conditions, but also on the mixing energetics imparted during the manufacturing process. Note that as energy is imparted over time and higher levels of amorphous norgestimate are present, the dissolution characteristics improve even when storage is unprotected under accelerated conditions. As stated in the specification at page 13, lines 11-22, taken together the data from these studies demonstrate that when a mixture of an excipient and a steroid active ingredient is subjected to sufficient mechanical energy, the excipient and the steroid active ingredient form a less crystalline, more highly energetic composition. Furthermore, under appropriate mixing conditions, the lactose component stabilizes the steroid in a highly energetic, substantially non-crystalline state, thus preventing recrystallization of the steroid. The highly energetic, non-crystalline steroid active ingredient dissolves more readily and is

Art Unit: 1616

better able to maintain desirable dissolution characteristics under a variety of conditions of ambient humidity and ambient temperature".

- Examiner has fully considered all the arguments.
- *Since MERCK, which teaches the crystallization process of estrone to show that estrone exists in both non-crystalline and crystalline forms. Applicant is kindly requested to explain how their claimed subject matter was not obvious at the time the invention was made.*
- Examiner notes, X-ray diffraction of the sample presented in example 1. Applicant may consider adding PXRD (Table 5) in claims.

Conclusion

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1616

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter, Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SABIHA QAZI, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER